

Gauge systems with noncommutative phase space

Vladimir Cuesta* and Merced Montesinos†

*Departamento de Física, Cinvestav, Av. Instituto Politécnico Nacional 2508,
San Pedro Zacatenco, 07360, Gustavo A. Madero, Ciudad de México, México*

José David Vergara‡

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 70-543, Ciudad de México, México

(Dated: February 7, 2008)

Some very simple models of gauge systems with noncanonical symplectic structures having $sl(2, r)$ as the gauge algebra are given. The models can be interpreted as noncommutative versions of the usual $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model of Montesinos-Rovelli-Thiemann. The symplectic structures of the noncommutative models, the first-class constraints, and the equations of motion are those of the usual $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ plus additional terms that involve the parameters $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ which encode the noncommutativity among the coordinates plus terms that involve the parameters $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$ associated with the noncommutativity among the momenta. Particularly interesting is the fact that the new first-class constraints get corrections linear and quadratic in the parameters $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ and $\Theta_{\mu\nu}$. The current constructions show that noncommutativity of coordinates and momenta can coexist with a gauge theory by explicitly building models that encode these properties. This is the first time models of this kind are reported which might be significant and interesting to the noncommutative community.

PACS numbers: 02.40.Gh, 11.10.Nx, 11.15.-q

Hamiltonian constrained systems with a finite number of degrees of freedom can be written in a Hamiltonian form by means of the dynamical equations of motion (summation convention over repeated indices is used throughout)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}^\mu &= \omega^{\mu\nu}(x) \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial x^\nu} + \lambda^a \frac{\partial \gamma_a}{\partial x^\nu} + \lambda^\alpha \frac{\partial \chi_\alpha}{\partial x^\nu} \right) \\ &= \omega^{\mu\nu}(x) \frac{\partial H_E}{\partial x^\nu}, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, 2, \dots, 2N,\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where $H_E = H + \lambda^a \gamma_a + \lambda^\alpha \chi_\alpha$ is the extended Hamiltonian,

$$\gamma_a(x) \approx 0, \quad \chi_\alpha(x) \approx 0, \quad (2)$$

are the constraints which define the constraint surface Σ embedded in the phase space Γ . Γ is a symplectic manifold endowed with the symplectic structure

$$\omega = \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu, \quad (3)$$

where (x^μ) are coordinates which locally label the points $\mathbf{p}$ of Γ . It is important to emphasize that the phase space Γ is considered as a single entity, i.e., Γ need not be necessarily interpreted as the cotangent bundle of a configuration space $\mathcal{C}$. H is taken to be a first-class Hamiltonian, the γ 's are first-class constraints while the χ 's are second class, i.e.,

$$\{\gamma_a, \gamma_b\}_\omega = C_{ab}{}^c \gamma_c + T_{ab}{}^{\alpha\beta} \chi_\alpha \chi_\beta, \quad (4a)$$

$$\{\gamma_a, \chi_\alpha\}_\omega = C_{a\alpha}{}^b \gamma_b + C_{a\alpha}{}^\beta \chi_\beta, \quad (4b)$$

$$\{H, \gamma_a\}_\omega = V_a{}^b \gamma_b + V_a{}^{\alpha\beta} \chi_\alpha \chi_\beta, \quad (4c)$$

$$\{H, \chi_\alpha\}_\omega = V_\alpha{}^b \gamma_b + V_\alpha{}^\beta \chi_\beta. \quad (4d)$$

Also,

$$\{\chi_\alpha, \chi_\beta\}_\omega = C_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \det(C_{\alpha\beta}) \neq 0, \quad (5)$$

where the Poisson brackets $\{, \}_\omega$ involved in Eqs. (4) and (5) are computed using the symplectic structure ω on Γ :

$$\{f, g\}_\omega = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu} \omega^{\mu\nu}(x) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^\nu}. \quad (6)$$

The dynamical equations of motion (1) and the constraints (2) can be obtained from the action principle [1, 2]

$$S[x^\mu, \lambda^a, \lambda^\alpha] = \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} (\theta_\mu(x) \dot{x}^\mu - H_E) d\tau, \quad (7)$$

where $H_E = H + \lambda^a \gamma_a + \lambda^\alpha \chi_\alpha$ as before, $\omega = d\theta$ with $\theta = \theta_\mu(x) dx^\mu$ the symplectic potential 1-form. It is important to emphasize that this way of formulating Hamiltonian constrained systems is beyond Dirac's method which, by construction, employs canonical symplectic structures [3, 4, 5, 6].

In order to set down the problem addressed in the paper which links the use of noncanonical symplectic structures in gauge theories to noncommutative geometry, it is convenient to say some words about the various notions of noncommutative geometry used by physicists.

*Electronic address: vcuesta@fis.cinvestav.mx

†Electronic address: merced@fis.cinvestav.mx

‡Electronic address: vergara@nucleares.unam.mx

1. First of all, there exists the so-called field theory defined on spacetimes endowed with noncommuting coordinates [7, 8], where the noncommutativity of the coordinates requires a noncommutativity among the field variables. In this sense, most of the work in this field of research consists in to mix consistently the noncommutativity of the coordinates of spacetime with the noncommutativity among the field variables [9, 10].

2. On the other hand, there exists a version where the noncommutativity of the coordinates of spacetime modifies the dynamics of test particles moving in it, in the sense that the equations of motion for the test particles get corrections that involve the parameters attached to the noncommuting coordinates [11]. There, the situation usually studied involves a Hamiltonian system without constraints, endowed with a canonical symplectic structure $\Omega = dp_i \wedge dq^i$, or, equivalently,

$$\{q^i, q^j\}_\Omega = 0, \{q^i, p_j\}_\Omega = \delta_j^i, \{p_i, p_j\}_\Omega = 0, \quad (8)$$

and with an action principle of the form

$$S[q^i, p_i] = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (p_i \dot{q}^i - H(q, p, t)) dt, \quad (9)$$

as a starting point. Next, the dynamical equations obtained from the action of Eq. (9) are *ad hoc* modified by replacing the original symplectic structure Ω with a new one ω_{nc} which involves noncommutativity among the coordinates q 's and among the p 's

$$\{q^i, q^j\}_{\omega_{nc}} = \theta^{ij}, \{q^i, p_j\}_{\omega_{nc}} = \delta_j^i, \{p_i, p_j\}_{\omega_{nc}} = \Theta_{ij}. \quad (10)$$

$\theta^{ij} = -\theta^{ji}$ and $\Theta_{ij} = -\Theta_{ji}$ are, usually, assumed to be constant parameters. The conceptual (or physical) explanation about the origin of noncommutativity depends on the particular theory assumed to be the fundamental one. Independently of the explanation, some consequences of the introduction of ω_{nc} are: (1) the original symmetries of the various geometrical objects involved might change, in particular, the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A}_{\omega_{nc}}$ (computed using ω_{nc}) might be *completely different* to the original one $\mathcal{A}_\Omega$ (computed using Ω), (2) the elements that form a complete set of commuting observables (csc) which are in involution with respect to Ω might be *completely different* to the elements that form a complete set of commuting observables computed with respect to ω_{nc} , in fact the elements of the former set are not in involution with respect to ω_{nc} in the generic case.

Therefore, it is rather natural to ask if there exists analogs for gauge systems of the situation previously mentioned in the item 2. In this paper, it is shown that the answer is in the affirmative and the term “gauge systems with noncommutative phase space” is used to refer to this fact, that is to say, that it is technically possible to start from a gauge system endowed with a canonical symplectic structure Ω and then to replace the original symplectic structure Ω in Γ with a new one ω_{nc} to build a new gauge system in such a way that the resulting gauge

group (more precisely, the gauge algebra of the first-class constraints) be the same than that of the original gauge system. Even though the analysis will be focused on the item 2, it will result clear at the end of the paper, that the current approach can also be used in the context of item 1.

The current ideas will be implemented in a nontrivial gauge system, the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model. The phase space $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^8$, whose points are locally labeled by $(x^\mu) = (u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2, p_1, p_2, \pi_1, \pi_2)$, is endowed with the symplectic structure

$$\Omega = dp_i \wedge du^i + d\pi_i \wedge dv^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (11)$$

which has the canonical form, in total agreement with Dirac's method. The model is defined by the action principle [12]

$$S[u^i, v^i, p_i, \pi_i, N, M, \lambda] = \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} (\dot{u}^i p_i + \dot{v}^i \pi_i - NH_1 - NH_2 - \lambda D) d\tau, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (12)$$

where the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(p_1)^2 + (p_2)^2 - (v^1)^2 - (v^2)^2] \approx 0, \\ H_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(\pi_1)^2 + (\pi_2)^2 - (u^1)^2 - (u^2)^2] \approx 0, \\ D &:= u^i p_i - v^i \pi_i \approx 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \{H_1, H_2\}_\Omega &= D, \\ \{H_1, D\}_\Omega &= -2H_1, \\ \{H_2, D\}_\Omega &= 2H_2. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which turn out to be isomorphic to those defining the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra.

Before going on, it is convenient to say that in order to make clear the concepts involved in the paper, the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model will be gradually modified, by first introducing one parameter, next two parameters, and finally, the generic case which allows noncommutativity among the coordinates and among the momenta involved. It will be shown for the case of the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model that it is always possible, at least locally, to maintain the same algebra and obtain as a consequence a new set of constraints that corresponds to the twisted generators of the original symmetry [9].

Model with one noncommutative parameter θ . As it was mentioned, the idea behind the current theoretical framework is to modify the symplectic structure (11) of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model by introducing a parameter θ that encodes the noncommutativity among the coordinates, the phase space of the system is still $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^8$, its points are still locally labeled by $(x^\mu) = (u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2, p_1, p_2, \pi_1, \pi_2)$, but now the inverse of the

new symplectic structure on it is given by

$$(\omega_{nc}^{\mu\nu}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Nevertheless, the original constraints (13) do *not* close under the bracket $\{A, B\}_{\omega_{nc}}$ computed with (15). In order to preserve the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ symmetry of the original system in the new model, it is mandatory to modify the original constraints. The more efficient way to build the new first class constraints is by means of Darboux's theorem [13]. According to it, it is always possible, at least locally, to find a map from the original coordinate system and symplectic structure (15) to a new coordinate system (Darboux's variables) in terms of which the symplectic structure acquires the ordinary canonical form. In the current case this map is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}^1 &= u^1 + \theta p_2 \\ \tilde{u}^2 &= u^2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Now, with respect to Darboux's variables $(\tilde{u}^1, \tilde{u}^2, \tilde{v}^1, \tilde{v}^2, \tilde{p}_1, \tilde{p}_2, \tilde{\pi}_1, \tilde{\pi}_2)$, the new constraints expressed in terms of the new variables have the same analytical form than the old constraints have in terms of the old variables. In terms of the original variables, the new constraints acquire the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(p_1)^2 + (p_2)^2 - (v^1)^2 - (v^2)^2] \approx 0, \\ \mathcal{H}_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(\pi_1)^2 + (\pi_2)^2 - (u^1)^2 - (u^2)^2] \\ &\quad - \theta u^1 p_2 - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 (p_2)^2 \approx 0, \\ \mathcal{D} &:= u^i p_i - v^i \pi_i + \theta p_1 p_2 \approx 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It turns out that the constraints (17) are also first-class, but *now* with respect to the Poisson brackets computed with the new symplectic structure of Eq. (15). The resulting algebra of constraints is

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2\}_{\omega_{nc}} &= \mathcal{D}, \\ \{\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{D}\}_{\omega_{nc}} &= -2\mathcal{H}_1, \\ \{\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{D}\}_{\omega_{nc}} &= 2\mathcal{H}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which is isomorphic to the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra, as expected. By inserting (15) and (17) with $(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \lambda^3) = (N, M, \lambda)$ and $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = (\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{D})$ into Eqs. (1)

leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u}^1 &= Np_1 - M\theta u^2 + \lambda(u^1 + 2\theta p_2), \\ \dot{u}^2 &= Np_2 + \lambda u^2, \\ \dot{v}^1 &= M\pi_1 - \lambda v^1, \\ \dot{v}^2 &= M\pi_2 - \lambda v^2, \\ \dot{p}_1 &= M(u^1 + \theta p_2) - \lambda p_1, \\ \dot{p}_2 &= Mu^2 - \lambda p_2, \\ \dot{\pi}_1 &= Nv^1 + \lambda\pi_1, \\ \dot{\pi}_2 &= Nv^2 + \lambda\pi_2, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

which are *different* from those corresponding to the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ system because there are terms that involve θ . Note that when $\theta = 0$, the symplectic structure (15), the constraints (17), and the dynamical equations of motion (19) acquire the same form of those corresponding to the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model.

Using (19), the evolution of the constraints (17) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathcal{H}}_1 &= M\mathcal{D} - 2\lambda\mathcal{H}_1, \\ \dot{\mathcal{H}}_2 &= -N\mathcal{D} + 2\lambda\mathcal{H}_2, \\ \dot{\mathcal{D}} &= -2M\mathcal{H}_2 + 2N\mathcal{H}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

in agreement with the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra (18).

Observables. It can be shown that the following six observables

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{12} &= u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{13} &= u^1 v^1 - p^1 \pi^1 + \theta v^1 p_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{14} &= u^1 v^2 - p_1 \pi_2 + \theta v^2 p_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{23} &= u^2 v^1 - p_2 \pi_1, \\ \mathcal{O}_{24} &= u^2 v^2 - p_2 \pi_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{34} &= \pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

are all gauge invariant. The resulting Lie algebra of their Poisson brackets computed with respect to the symplectic structure (15) is isomorphic to the Lie algebra of the Lie group $SO(2, 2)$, i.e., the algebra of observables is exactly the same than that of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model. The four relations among the observables are the same than those of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model but now the expression of the observables are

$$\epsilon = \frac{u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2}{|u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2|}, \quad (22)$$

$$\epsilon' = \frac{\pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2}{|\pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2|}, \quad (23)$$

$$J = |u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2|, \quad (24)$$

$$\alpha = \arctan \left(\frac{u^1 v^2 - p^1 \pi^2 + \theta v^2 p_2}{u^1 v^1 - p_1 \pi_1 + \theta p_2 v^1} \right). \quad (25)$$

Model with two noncommutative parameters θ and ϕ . Now, the symplectic structure (11) of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model is modified by introducing two parameters θ and ϕ which encode the noncommutativity

among the coordinates, the phase space of the system is still $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^8$, its points are still locally labeled by $(x^\mu) = (u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2, p_1, p_2, \pi_1, \pi_2)$, but now the inverse of the new symplectic structure on it is given by

$$(\omega_{\text{nc}}^{\mu\nu}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \theta & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\phi & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

As for the case of the model with one parameter θ , the original constraints of Eq. (13) get also modified, by terms linear and quadratic in the noncommutative parameters θ and ϕ . The new constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(p_1)^2 + (p_2)^2 - (v^1)^2 - (v^2)^2] \\ &\quad - \phi v^1 \pi_2 - \frac{1}{2} \phi^2 (\pi_2)^2 \approx 0, \\ \mathcal{C}_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(\pi_1)^2 + (\pi_2)^2 - (u^1)^2 - (u^2)^2] \\ &\quad - \theta u^1 p_2 - \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 (p_2)^2 \approx 0, \\ \mathcal{V} &:= u^i p_i - v^i \pi_i + \theta p_1 p_2 - \phi \pi_1 \pi_2 \approx 0, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

with $i = 1, 2$ [cf. with Eqs. (17)]. It turns out that the constraints of Eq. (27) are also first-class but *now* with respect to the Poisson brackets computed with the new symplectic structure of Eq. (26). The resulting algebra of constraints is

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{H}_2\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= \mathcal{V}, \\ \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{V}\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= -2\mathcal{C}_1, \\ \{\mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{V}\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= 2\mathcal{C}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which is isomorphic to the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra.

By plugging (26), (27), $(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \lambda^3) = (N, M, \lambda)$, and $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3) = (\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{V})$ into Eqs. (1), the dynamical equations (1) acquire the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u}^1 &= N p_1 - M \theta u^2 + \lambda (u^1 + 2\theta p_2), \\ \dot{u}^2 &= N p_2 + \lambda u^2, \\ \dot{v}^1 &= M \pi_1 - \lambda (v^1 + 2\phi \pi_2) - \phi N v^2, \\ \dot{v}^2 &= M \pi_2 - \lambda v^2, \\ \dot{p}_1 &= M (u^1 + \theta p_2) - \lambda p_1, \\ \dot{p}_2 &= M u^2 - \lambda p_2, \\ \dot{\pi}_1 &= N (v^1 + \phi \pi_2) + \lambda \pi_1, \\ \dot{\pi}_2 &= N v^2 + \lambda \pi_2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

[cf. with Eqs. (19)]. Using (29), the evolution of the constraints (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathcal{C}}_1 &= M \mathcal{V} - 2\lambda \mathcal{C}_1, \\ \dot{\mathcal{C}}_2 &= -N \mathcal{V} + 2\lambda \mathcal{C}_2, \\ \dot{\mathcal{V}} &= -2M \mathcal{C}_2 + 2N \mathcal{C}_1, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

in agreement with the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra (28).

Observables. The following six observables

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{12} &= u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{13} &= u^1 v^1 - p^1 \pi^1 + \theta v^1 p_2 + \theta \phi p_2 \pi_2 + \phi u^1 \pi_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{14} &= u^1 v^2 - p_1 \pi_2 + \theta v^2 p_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{23} &= u^2 v^1 - p_2 \pi_1 + \phi u^2 \pi_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{24} &= u^2 v^2 - p_2 \pi_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{34} &= \pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2 - \phi (\pi_2)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

are all gauge invariant. Again, the resulting Lie algebra of their Poisson brackets computed with respect to the symplectic structure (26) is isomorphic to the Lie algebra of the Lie group $SO(2, 2)$, i.e., the algebra of observables is exactly the same than that of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model. The four relations among the observables is the same than those of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model but now the expression of the observables are

$$\epsilon = \frac{u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2}{|u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2|}, \quad (32)$$

$$\epsilon' = \frac{\pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2 - \phi (\pi_2)^2}{|\pi_1 v^2 - v^1 \pi_2 - \phi (\pi_2)^2|}, \quad (33)$$

$$J = |u^1 p_2 - p_1 u^2 + \theta (p_2)^2|, \quad (34)$$

$$\alpha = \arctan \left(\frac{u^1 v^2 - p^1 \pi^2 + \theta v^2 p_2}{u^1 v^1 - p_1 \pi_1 + \theta p_2 v^1} \right). \quad (35)$$

Model with noncommuting momenta and noncommuting coordinates. The more general case corresponds to consider noncommutativity among all the momenta $p_\mu = (p_1, p_2, \pi_1, \pi_2)$ and among all the coordinates $x^\mu = (u^1, u^2, v^1, v^2)$. In this case the noncommutative brackets are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \{x^\mu, x^\nu\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= \theta^{\mu\nu}, \\ \{p_\mu, p_\nu\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= \Theta_{\mu\nu}, \\ \{x^\mu, p_\nu\}_{\omega_{\text{nc}}} &= \delta^\mu_\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where, in order that could be possible to get a representation in terms of commutative variables [11], the noncommutative parameters are restricted by $\theta^{\mu\nu} \Theta_{\nu\rho} = 4\alpha\beta(\alpha\beta - 1)\delta^\mu_\rho$, with (α, β) arbitrary real parameters. Taking this relation into account the commutative variables are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}^\mu &= \frac{\beta}{\rho} x^\mu + \frac{\theta^{\mu\nu}}{2\alpha\rho} p_\nu, \\ \tilde{p}_\mu &= \frac{\alpha}{\rho} p_\mu - \frac{\Theta_{\mu\nu}}{2\beta\rho} x^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

with $\rho = 2\alpha\beta - 1$ and the new constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(\tilde{p}_1)^2 + (\tilde{p}_2)^2 - (\tilde{v}^1)^2 - (\tilde{v}^2)^2] \approx 0, \\ \gamma_2 &:= \frac{1}{2} [(\tilde{\pi}_1)^2 + (\tilde{\pi}_2)^2 - (\tilde{u}^1)^2 - (\tilde{u}^2)^2] \approx 0, \\ d &:= \tilde{u}^i \tilde{p}_i - \tilde{v}^i \tilde{\pi}_i \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The algebra of these constraints will be isomorphic to the $sl(2, r)$ Lie algebra by construction. However, when these constraints are written explicitly in terms of the noncommuting variables (36), they become the twist generators of the $sl(2, r)$ algebra. Also, for this noncommutative model, it is possible to construct Dirac's observables

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_{12} &= \tilde{u}^1 \tilde{p}_2 - \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{u}^2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{13} &= \tilde{u}^1 \tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{p}^1 \tilde{\pi}^1, \\ \mathcal{O}_{14} &= \tilde{u}^1 \tilde{v}^2 - \tilde{p}_1 \tilde{\pi}_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{23} &= \tilde{u}^2 \tilde{v}^1 - \tilde{p}_2 \tilde{\pi}_1, \\ \mathcal{O}_{24} &= u^2 v^2 - p_2 \pi_2, \\ \mathcal{O}_{34} &= \tilde{\pi}_1 \tilde{v}^2 - \tilde{v}^1 \tilde{\pi}_2,\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

which are all gauge invariant under the transformation generated by the first class constraints.

Furthermore, the resulting Lie algebra of their Poisson brackets computed with respect to the symplectic structure (36) is isomorphic to the Lie algebra of the Lie group $SO(2, 2)$, i.e., the algebra of observables is exactly the same than that of the original $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ model.

The relevance of the noncommutative models of this paper lies in the fact that it has been explicitly shown that it possible to introduce noncommutativity among coordinates and among momenta which are both compatible with the gauge principle in the sense that algebra of generators closes [cf. with Ref. [14]]. The result shows that it is possible, in the context of noncommu-

tative quantum mechanics, to twist the gauge symmetry in agreement with a recent proposal in field theory[15]. The generalization of these results to noncommutative field theory (item 1 of this paper) would mean that it is possible to modify the usual symplectic structure among the field variables by symplectic structures involving noncommuting field variables. Due to the fact that the noncommutativity among the gauge fields is related to the noncommutativity of the coordinates of spacetime, a mechanism to combine consistently the two types of noncommutativity must be required, for instance incorporating the coordinates as dynamical variables (e.g., parameterizing the field theory) to set noncommuting coordinates of spacetime and noncommuting fields on the same footing [16]. By doing things in this way, both types of noncommutativity would emerge in an extended phase space endowed with noncommutative symplectic structures, situation that can be handled with the same ideas developed in this work.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by CONACyT Grant Nos. SEP-2003-C02-43939 and 47211. J.D. Vergara also acknowledges support from DGAPA-UNAM Grant No. IN104503.

-
- [1] M. Mondragón and M. Montesinos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **19**, 2473 (2004); gr-qc/0312048.
 - [2] M. Montesinos, in *VI Mexican School on Gravitation and Mathematical Physics*, edited by M. Alcubierre, J.L. Cervantes-Cota, and M. Montesinos *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **24** (Institute of Physics Publishing, Bristol and Philadelphia, 2005) pp. 44-51; gr-qc/0602072.
 - [3] P.A.M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. **2**, 129 (1950).
 - [4] P.A.M. Dirac, Can. J. Math. **3**, 1 (1951).
 - [5] P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **246**, 326 (1958).
 - [6] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (Belfer Graduate School of Science, New York, 1964).
 - [7] H.S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 38 (1947).
 - [8] M.R. Douglas and N.A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 977 (2001) (and references therein).
 - [9] M. Chaichian, P.P. Kulish, K. Nishijima, and A. Tureanu, Phys. Lett. B **604**, 98 (2004).
 - [10] M. Chaichian, P. Preussker, and A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 151602 (2005).
 - [11] K. Li, J. Wang, and C. Chen, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **20**, 2165 (2005).
 - [12] M. Montesinos, C. Rovelli, and T. Thiemann, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 044009 (1999); gr-qc/9901073.
 - [13] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, second edition (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989).
 - [14] M. Chaichian and A. Tureanu, Phys. Lett. B **637**, 199 (2006).
 - [15] J. Wess, "Deformed gauge theories" arXiv:hep-th/0608135
 - [16] M. Rosenbaum, J.D. Vergara, and L.R. Juárez, "Canonical quantization, space-time noncommutativity and deformed symmetries in field theory," arXiv:hep-th/0611160.